

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MATTHEW SUND,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 LABOR READY NORTHWEST et al.,

14 Defendants.
15

Case No. C17-895RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

16 *Pro Se* Plaintiff, Matthew Sund, has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in
17 this matter. Dkt. #4. Mr. Sund's first Complaint was filed on June 12, 2017, listing as
18 defendants Labor Ready Northwest and SanMar Corporation. Dkt. #5. On June 16, 2017, the
19 Court issued an Order directing Mr. Sund to file an amended complaint. Dkt. #7. The Court
20 found that Mr. Sund's Complaint contained almost no factual detail, relied on form language,
21 and was insufficient to support a Title VII claim. *Id.* Mr. Sund did not clearly identify what
22 laws or statutes he believed were being violated by the two Defendants in this case, and he did
23 not support his claims with specific facts. Accordingly, the Court found that it was unclear
24 how federal subject matter jurisdiction arises in this matter. *Id.* The Court ordered Plaintiff to
25 submit an Amended Complaint stating: (1) the laws or statutes under which he brings each of
26 his claims against each of the Defendants; (2) exactly what facts support each of the alleged
27
28

1 violations of law; and (3) what specific injury Plaintiff suffered because of each alleged
2 violation of law. *Id.*

3 On June 26, 2017, Mr. Sund filed his Amended Complaint. Dkt. #10. This Amended
4 Complaint uses the same form as the first Complaint, stating a Title VII claim and citing to 42
5 U.S.C. § 2000e-5. Dkt. #10 at 2. Mr. Sund has elaborated on the underlying facts of this case
6 to a certain extent. For example, Mr. Sund now claims that Oralia Brooks, a manager at Labor
7 Ready Northwest, stated she was Mormon. *Id.* Mr. Sund details a process by which he was
8 offered a temporary employment contract but was not paid on time or hired on after the term.
9 *Id.* Mr. Sund does not connect Oralia Brooks' religion to Defendants' failure to hire him. Mr.
10 Sund now alleges that he "suffered a monetary loss in the amount of approximately \$100,000,"
11 and that "[m]isconduct caused the loss of an expensive diplomatic vehicle." *Id.* Mr. Sund does
12 not explain how Defendants' actions caused these losses.

13
14
15 The Court will dismiss a Complaint at any time if the action fails to state a claim, raises
16 frivolous or malicious claims, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from
17 such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Mr. Sund's Amended Complaint is again lacking
18 support for essential elements of his federal claim. Ms. Brooks' religion does not appear to be
19 connected in any way to Mr. Sund's contract claims. Mr. Sund's claims appear to be frivolous
20 and insufficient to establish federal subject matter jurisdiction.

21
22 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint suffers from deficiencies that, if not
23 adequately explained in response to this Order, require dismissal. In Response to this Order,
24 Plaintiff must write a short and plain statement telling the Court: (1) how he has a valid Title
25 VII claim (2) how he calculated his damages of \$100,000; and (3) why this case should not be
26 dismissed as frivolous. This statement may be filed as a "Response to Order to Show Cause"
27
28

1 and does not alter or amend Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. The Court will take no other
2 action in this case until it receives Plaintiff's Response.

3 Therefore, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file a Response to
4 this Order to Show Cause containing the detail described above **no later than fourteen (14)**
5 **days from the date of this Order.** The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at
6 6337 S. HIGHLAND DR. #213 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84121.
7

8
9 DATED this 27 day of June, 2017.

10
11 

12 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
13 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28